

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/642,936	08/18/2003	Naoyuki Koizumi	CU-3332 RJS	4286
26530	7590 04/05/2005		EXAMINER	
LADAS & PARRY LLP			DOTY, HEATHER ANNE	
224 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE SUITE 1200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO,	IL 60604		2813	
			DATE MAILED: 04/05/2009	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

_				<i>_</i>			
		Application No	. Applicar				
Office Action Summary		10/642,936	KOIZUM	I, NAOYUKI			
		Examiner	Art Unit				
·		Heather A. Doty					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communicator Reply	tion appears on the cove	r sheet with the correspond	dence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt - Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuth are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION.  7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, how cation.  lays, a reply within the statutory mory period will apply and will expire,  by statute, cause the application	vever, may a reply be timely filed inimum of thirty (30) days will be consist SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C.	idered timely. ate of this communication. § 133).			
Status							
1)[🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on 23 March 2005.		•			
2a)□	·	☐ This action is non-fir	nal.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the appl 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) <u>1</u> is/are objected to. Claim(s) <u>6-8</u> are subject to restriction a	withdrawn from conside					
Applicat	ion Papers		·				
9)[	The specification is objected to by the B	Examiner.		;			
10)🛛	The drawing(s) filed on <u>18 August 2003</u> Applicant may not request that any objection		•				
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to be	e correction is required if the	ne drawing(s) is objected to. S	See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119		·	•			
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority do  3. Copies of the certified copies of application from the International See the attached detailed Office action for	ocuments have been reconcuments have been reconthe priority documents have bureau (PCT Rule 17.	eived. eived in Application No ave been received in this I 2(a)).	<u></u>			
Attachmer	ıt(s)						
_	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	· 4) 🗀	Interview Summary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice 3) Information	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT er No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/18/03, 2/28/05</u> .	O/SB/08) 5)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date	cation (PTO-152)			

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: In line 16, remove the last word, "the". Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood et al. (U.S. 5,904,546) in view of Coleman (U.S. 4,729,971).

With respect to claim 1, Wood et al. teaches a method of fabricating a semiconductor chip from a semiconductor wafer having a first surface (14 in Fig. 1) supporting a semiconductor element and a second surface opposite the first surface (18 in Fig. 2), the method comprising the steps of: performing anisotropic etching on a remaining portion of the cutting portion from one or both of the first surface and the second surface, thereby cutting the cutting portion of the semiconductor wafer (column 4, lines 21-23, 49-53; Fig. 3).

Wood et al. does not teach performing isotropic etching at least partially on a cutting portion of the semiconductor wafer from one or both of the first surface and the second surface.

Art Unit: 2813

Coleman teaches a method of fabricating a semiconductor chip from a semiconductor wafer comprising performing isotropic etching at least partially on a cutting portion of the semiconductor wafer (column 3, lines 44-45) from a first surface (column 2, line 5) to give smooth edges (abstract).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the methods of Coleman and Wood et al. to perform isotropic etching at least partially on a cutting portion of the semiconductor wafer, as taught by Coleman, and then perform anisotropic etching on a remaining portion of the cutting portion, thereby cutting the cutting portion of the semiconductor wafer, as taught by Wood et al. The motivation for doing so at the time of the invention would have been to give the etched surface sloped sidewalls (Wood et al., column 3, line 65) on one portion and smooth sidewalls (Coleman, abstract) on another portion.

With respect to claim 2, Coleman and Wood et al. together teach the method as claimed in claim 1. Coleman further teaches forming a resist on the first surface to expose the cutting portion on the first surface, when the cutting portion is isotropically etched from the first surface (column 3, lines 23-27).

With respect to claim 4, Coleman and Wood et al. together teach the method as claimed in claim 1. Wood et al. further teaches forming a resist on the second surface to expose the cutting portion on the second surface (etch mask **24** in Fig. 3A; column 3, lines 42-43). As noted above, Coleman teaches that the cutting portion is isotropically etched. Therefore, it would be obvious to combine the teachings of Coleman and Wood et al. to arrive at the invention as specified in claim 4, for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood et al. (U.S. 5,904,546) in view of Coleman (U.S. 4,729,971) as applied to claims 2 and 4 above, and further in view of Bunch et al. (U.S. 2002/0145827).

Page 4

With respect to claims 3 and 5, Wood et al. and Coleman together teach the method as claimed in claim 2—as further limited by claim 3—and claim 4—as further limited by claim 5. They do not teach that the resist has rounded-off corners.

Bunch et al. teaches etching a silicon substrate using a resist with rounded-off corners to produce a surface with rounded edges (page 4, claim 20).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the rounded-off resist pattern taught by Bunch et al. as an etch mask for the isotropic etch taught by Coleman and the anisotropic etch taught by Wood et al. to arrive at the invention as specified in claims 3 and 5. The motivation for doing so at the time of the invention would have been to achieve a surface with rounded edges, as expressly taught by Bunch et al.

### Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-5 in the reply filed on 3/23/05 is acknowledged.

Application/Control Number: 10/642,936 Page 5

Art Unit: 2813

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Wegleiter et al. (U.S. 5,972,781) teaches a method of dicing a semiconductor wafer by an initial anisotropic etch from a surface supporting a semiconductor element followed by an isotropic etch from the opposite surface that fully cuts the wafer.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Heather A. Doty whose telephone number is 571-272-8429. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Whitehead, Jr. can be reached on 571-272-1702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CRAIG A. THOMPSON PRIMARY EXAMINER